UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
KRISTIN A. CARMODY, M.D, M.H.P.E. Plaintiff,	Case No.: 1:21-cv-08186-VF
- against -	
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY; NYU GROSSMAN SCHOOL OF MEDICINE; NYU LANGONE HOSPITALS; ROBERT I. GROSSMAN, M.D.; and ROBERT J. FEMIA, M.D.	<u>Verdict Form</u>
Defendants.	
VALERIE FIGUEREDO, United States Magistrate	Judge:
PLEASE CHECK (\checkmark) All jurors must agree on the ans	•
I. Gender Discrimination under Title VII of	the Civil Rights Act of 1964
1. Has Dr. Carmody proved, by a prepo	inderance of the evidence, that she was
subjected to a discriminatory termination by NYU b	pased on her gender in violation of Title VII?
YES	NO

II. Gender Discrimination under New York State and City Human Rights Law

2. Ha	as Dr. Carr	Or. Carmody proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she was				
subjected to a discriminatory termination based on her gender in violation of the New York State						
Human Rights La	ıw?					
	a)	By NYU?				
		YES NO				
	b)	By Dr. Robert I. Grossman? [You may only answer YES to this				
	question if you answered YES to Question No. 2(a).]					
		YESNO				
	c)	By Dr. Robert J. Femia? [You may only answer YES to this				
	quest	ion if you answered YES to Question No. 2(a).]				
		YES NO				

3.

Has Dr. Carmody proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she was

YES _____ NO_

subjected to a discrim	inatory	termination based on her gender in violation of the New York City
Human Rights Law?		
	a)	By NYU?
		YESNO
	b)	By Dr. Robert I. Grossman? [You may only answer YES to this
	questio	n if you answered YES to Question No. 3(a).]
		YES
	c)	By Dr. Robert J. Femia? [You may only answer YES to this
	questio	n if you answered YES to Ouestion No. 3(a).1

III. Retaliation under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

	4.	Has Dr. Carmody proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that NYU					
subject	ed her	to a retaliatory terminati	on based on he	er prote	ected activity in violation of Title VII?		
		YES		NO_	\checkmark		

IV. Retaliation under New York State Human Rights Law

- 5. Has Dr. Carmody proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she was subjected to a retaliatory termination based on her protected activity in violation of the New York State Human Rights Law?
 - a) By NYU?

 YES _____ NO____

 b) By Dr. Robert J. Femia? [You may only answer YES to this question if you answered YES to Question No. 5(a).]

 YES _____ NO____✓

V. Retaliation under New York City Human Rights Law

	6.	Has Dr. Car	mody proved, by	a preponde	rance of the	evidence,	that she was
subje	cted to a	retaliatory te	rmination based	on her prote	cted activity	in violati	on of the New
York	City Hu	man Rights L	aw?				
		c)	By NYU?				
		0)	•	ES	NO		
			ĭ	ES	_ NO_	<u> </u>	
		d)	By Dr. Rober	t J. Femia? [You may onl	y answer	YES to this
		ques	tion if you answe	ered YES to Q	Question No.	6(a).]	
			Y	ES	. NO_	✓	
VI.	Retali	ation under	New York Labo	or Law			
	7.	Has Dr. Car.	mody proved, by	a prepondei	rance of the ϵ	evidence,	that she was
subjec	cted to a	retaliatory te	rmination based	on her protec	cted activity	in violatio	on of the New
York	Labor La	aw?					
		e)	By NYU?				
		C)	Dy IVIO:			/	
			Y.	ES	NO_	<u> </u>	
		f)	By Dr. Robert	J. Femia? []	You may only	v answer	YES to this
		quesi	ion if you answe	red YES to Q	Question No.	7(a).]	
			Y	ES	NO	\checkmark	

VII. Retaliation under Equal Pay Act

8. Has Dr. Carmody proved, by a preponderance of the evidence, that NYU subjected her to a retaliatory termination based on her protected activity in violation of the Equal Pay Act?

		. (
YES	NO	V

DAMAGES

Questions 9-18 need only be answered if you answered YES to one or more of the prior questions.

9.	Has Dr. Carmody proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she is entitled
to back pa	ay, as a result of the discriminatory and/or retaliatory termination of her employment?
	YES NO
10	If you answered "YES" to Question 9, state below the amount that is to be
awarded i	n back pay. If you answered "NO" to Question 9, proceed to Question 11.
	\$
11	. Has Dr. Carmody proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she is entitled
to front pa	ay, as a result of the discriminatory and/or retaliatory termination of her employment?
	YES NO
12	If you answered "YES" to Question 11, state below the amount that is to be
awarded i	n front pay. If you answered "NO" to Question 11, proceed to Question 13.
	\$
13	. Do you find that Dr. Carmody has proven by a preponderance of evidence, that
she is enti	tled to compensatory damages for pain, suffering or emotional distress that she
experienc	ed as a result of the discriminatory and/or retaliatory termination of her employment?
	YES NO

14.	If you answered "YES" to Question 13, state below the amount that is to be			
awarded in co	ompensatory da	amages for pain, suff	ering, or emotion	nal distress. If you answered
"NO" to Que	stion 13, proce	ed to Question 15.		
		\$		
15.	If you answe	red "YES" to any Qu	estions Nos. 1 th	arough 6, do you find that
Defendant, N	YU, should be	subject to punitive d	amages?	
		YES	NO	
16.	If you answe	red "YES" to Questi	on 15, state belov	v the amount of punitive
damages, if a	ny, that you aw	vard to Plaintiff:		
		\$		
17.	Has Dr. Carn	nody proved, by a pro	eponderance of the	he evidence, that any of the
following De	fendants willfu	illy violated the New	York Labor Law	<i>י</i> ?
	a)	By NYU?		
		YES_		1O
	b)	By Dr. Robert J. Fe	emia?	
		YES _		NO
18.	Has Dr. Carn	nody proved, by a pro	eponderance of the	ne evidence, that NYU willfully
violated the E	qual Pay Act?			
		YES	NO	_

Case 1:21-cv-08186-VF Document 240 Filed 04/17/24 Page 9 of 9

Please have the foreperson sign and date this Verdict Form and advise the Court by note that you have reached a verdict.

Dated: New York, New York

APRIL 16 , 2024

Uma Hypun Jury Foreperson